



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,141	05/14/2001	Jay Ryan Torgerson	MWS-006	1730

959 7590 08/20/2004  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
----------

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/858,141	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TORGERSON, JAY RYAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Laurie Ries	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 5/14/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25-27, 31, 32, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) in further view of Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189).

As per claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 26, 31, and 37, Sanford discloses a method, electronic device in the form of a computer, memory, and system of navigating a hierarchical diagram, in the form of a Web-based menu system, which contains levels and associated sub-levels, and includes displaying a first view of the diagram or menu structure to a user of the electronic device on the display, which represents a level of the diagram or menu and includes a graphical reference, in the form of a triangle, to one of the sub-levels associated with the level represented by the first view. (See Sanford, Figure 7, and Column 6, line 67, Column 7, lines 1-2). This method and system also includes traversing the first view of the diagram or menu with a user-operated pointing device, such as a mouse, which inserts a cursor in the first view. The cursor moves in a synchronized manner with user-initiated movements of the pointing device, or

Art Unit: 2176

mouse. (See Sanford, Column 7, lines 11-14). Sanford does not disclose expressly the step of manipulating the mouse so that the cursor in the first view enters an active region located within the graphical reference to a sub-level, where the active region includes a portion of the graphical reference and where the cursor movement automatically triggers replacement of the first view with the second view in the display, also displaying the cursor in the second view.

Kikuchi discloses that upon movement of a cursor to the active region of a second view, represented by the visible portion of an underlying window, with the underlying window representing the second view, the first view, being the displayed window, is replaced by the second view, represented by the underlying window, and the cursor appears in the second view. (See Kikuchi, Figures 2A and 2B, Column 5, lines 24-68, and Column 6, lines 1-14). Sanford and Kikuchi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method for navigating a hierarchical diagram, in the form of a Web-based menu system, of Sanford, with the cursor control and display manipulation of Kikuchi. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need for the user to manually press a mouse button or enter special control codes via a keyboard to initiate a change to the display. (See Kikuchi, Column 7, lines 48-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kikuchi with Sanford for the benefit of eliminating unnecessary actions by a user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 26, 31, and 37.

As per claims 2, 13, 21, 27, 32, and 38, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claims 1, 12, 20, 26, 31, and 37 as described above. Kikuchi also discloses the step of manipulating the pointing device so that the cursor in the display travels from the first view into the graphical reference to a second view, represented by the visible portion of an underlying window, and that the cursor appears in the second view without stopping. (See Kikuchi, Column 5, lines 24-68, and Column 6, lines 1-14). Sanford and Kikuchi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the cursor movement of Kikuchi. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need for the user to manually press a mouse button or enter special control codes via a keyboard to initiate a change to the display. (See Kikuchi, Column 7, lines 48-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kikuchi with Sanford for the benefit of eliminating unnecessary actions by a user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2, 13, 21, 27, 32, and 38.

As per claims 3, 22, and 28, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claims 1, 20, and 26 as described above. Kikuchi also discloses that a graphical reference including an active region is presented in the form of the visible portion of an underlying window. (See Kikuchi, Column 7, lines 17-47). Kikuchi also discloses manipulating the mouse so that the cursor in a second view, in the form of an underlying window, enters a graphical reference to the

Art Unit: 2176

level, and the cursor reappears in the first view. (See Kikuchi, Figures 2A and 2B, Column 5, lines 24-67, and Column 6, lines 1-14). Sanford and Kikuchi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the cursor movement and display manipulation of Kikuchi. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need for the user to manually press a mouse button or enter special control codes via a keyboard to initiate a change to the display. (See Kikuchi, Column 7, lines 48-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kikuchi with Sanford for the benefit of eliminating unnecessary actions by a user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 22, and 28.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) and Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Young (U.S. Patent 5,299,307).

As per claim 4, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Sanford and Kikuchi do not disclose expressly providing an escape rate associated with the graphical reference to the sub-level, which is a designated cursor speed which the cursor must exceed while traveling through the active region located within the graphical reference to the sub-level in order to avoid replacing the first view with the second view in the display. Young discloses that a cursor must exceed a certain speed while traveling through an

Art Unit: 2176

active region to avoid altering the display. (See Young, Figure 22, and Column 14, lines 49-62). Sanford, Kikuchi and Young are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the cursor speed control of Young. The motivation for doing so would have been to assist in determining whether or not user's intention was to alter the display. (See Young, Column 2, lines 35-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Young with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of easily determining the user's intentions to obtain the invention as described in claim 4.

As per claim 5, Sanford, Kikuchi and Young disclose the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Young also discloses manipulating the pointing device, or mouse, so that the cursor rate of travel exceeds the escape rate while traveling through the active region located in the graphical reference to the sub-level, and the first view remains displayed in the display. (See Young, Figure 22, and Column 14, lines 49-62). Sanford, Kikuchi and Young are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the cursor speed control of Young. The motivation for doing so would have been to assist in determining whether or not user's intention was to alter the display. (See Young, Column 2, lines 35-38). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2176

been obvious to combine Young with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of easily determining the user's intentions to obtain the invention as described in claim 5.

As per claim 6, Sanford, Kikuchi and Young disclose the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Young also discloses manipulating the pointing device, or mouse, so that the cursor rate of travel does not exceed the escape rate while traveling through the graphical reference to the sub-level, and that the first view is replaced by the second view in the display. (See Young, Figure 22, and Column 14, lines 49-62). Sanford, Kikuchi and Young are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the cursor speed control of Young. The motivation for doing so would have been to assist in determining whether or not user's intention was to alter the display. (See Young, Column 2, lines 35-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Young with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of easily determining the user's intentions to obtain the invention as described in claim 6.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 19, 23, 24, 29, 30, 36, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) and Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189) as applied to claims 1, 12, 20, 26, 31, and 37 above, and further in view of Falcon (U.S. Patent 6,285,374 B1).

As per claims 7, 19, 23, 29, 36, and 41, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claims 1, 12, 20, 26, 31, and 37 as described above. Sanford and



Art Unit: 2176

Kikuchi do not disclose expressly providing a wormhole around the active region, representing a visual aid indicating the location of the active region, and altering the size of the wormhole based upon the proximity of the cursor, where the wormhole grows larger as the cursor travels nearer the wormhole, and smaller as the cursor travels away from the wormhole. Falcon discloses a hot spot, equivalent to a wormhole, which graphically denotes the active region on the display. (See Falcon, Figure 3, and Column 6, lines 15-22). Falcon also discloses altering the size of the hot spot to be larger or smaller based upon the location of the cursor. (See Falcon, Figure 9, elements 182, 184, and 186). Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the hot spot of Falcon. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a larger area in which the user is able to identify and maneuver within to activate a change to the display, thus eliminating the need for more precision in manipulation of the pointing device. (See Falcon, Column 2, lines 28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Falcon with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of ease of use of the system to obtain the invention as described in claims 7, 19, 23, 29, 36, and 41.

As per claim 8, Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon disclose the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Falcon also discloses providing a minimum radius, or size, for the wormhole or hot spot, corresponding to the initial size of the

Art Unit: 2176

wormhole or hot spot in the display (See Falcon, Column 5, lines 62-63); providing a maximum radius, or size, being larger than the minimum radius or size and corresponding to the maximum size of the wormhole or hot spot in the display (See Falcon, Column 8, lines 58-64); and adjusting the size of the displayed wormhole or hot spot based on the cursor proximity to the wormhole or hot spot, the display size being between the maximum and minimum sizes. (See Falcon, Figure 9, element 188, Column 10, lines 66-67, and Column 11, lines 1-24). Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon with the sizing of the hot spot of Falcon. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more distinct visual reference assisting the user in activating a change to the display, thus reducing user fatigue. (See Falcon, Column 6, lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Falcon with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of ease of use of the system to obtain the invention as described in claim 8.

As per claims 11, 24, and 30, Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon disclose the limitations of claims 7, 20 and 29 as described above. Falcon also discloses sending a message to an operating system of the electronic device which registers a request for notification of the movements of the cursor in the display (See Falcon, Column 6, lines 36-43), receiving notification of the movements of the cursor in the display which are reported as display coordinates (See Falcon,

Art Unit: 2176

Column 6, lines 36-38), comparing the reported cursor coordinates with the coordinates of the active region located within the graphical reference to the sub-level in the display (See Falcon, Column 6, lines 52-58), and adjusting the size of the wormhole or hot spot based on the results of the comparison. (See Falcon, Figure 9, elements 186 and 188). Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon with the system notification of cursor movements of Falcon. The motivation for doing so would have been to reconcile any instances of multiple event signals generated by a mouse or pointing device. (See Falcon, Column 7, lines 27-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Falcon with Sanford and Kikuchi for the benefit of resolving multiple signals from a pointing device to obtain the invention as described in claims 11, 24, and 30.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1), Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189), and Falcon (U.S. Patent 6,285,374 B1) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Slotznick (U.S. Publication 2002/0178007 A1).

As per claim 9, Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon disclose the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon do not disclose expressly providing a time parameter which provides a minimum amount of time the cursor is required to remain within the active region, and manipulating the

Art Unit: 2176

pointing device, or mouse, so that the cursor remains within the active region for at least the amount of time specified by the time parameter, triggering replacement of the first view with the second view in the display. Slotznick discloses the use of a time period to invoke an action, including manipulating a pointing device such that the cursor remains in the active region for a period of time equal to or exceeding the time period specified, thus activating the specified action (See Slotznick, Page 9, paragraph 0119), which, incorporated into the system of Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon, would include replacement of the first view on the display with a second view. Sanford, Kikuchi, Falcon, and Slotznick are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon with the time period restrictions of Slotznick. The motivation for doing so would have been to simplify the user's ability to maneuver between documents or displays, especially when a user may require special needs in manipulating a display. (See Slotznick, page 2, paragraph 0015 and 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Slotznick with Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon for the benefit of ease of use of the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

As per claim 10, Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon disclose the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon do not disclose expressly providing a time parameter which provides a minimum amount of time the cursor is required to remain within the active region, and manipulating the

Art Unit: 2176

pointing device, or mouse, so that the cursor remains within the active region for a time period not exceeding the time parameter before leaving the active region, thereby not triggering the replacement of the first view on the display. Slotznick discloses the use of a time period to invoke an action, including manipulating a pointing device such that the cursor does not remain in the active region for a period of time equal to or exceeding the time period specified, thus failing to activate the specified action (See Slotznick, Page 9, paragraph 0119), which, incorporated into the system of Sanford, Kikuchi, and Falcon, would include not replacing the first view on the display. Sanford, Kikuchi, Falcon, and Slotznick are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating and simplifying user displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon with the time period restrictions of Slotznick. The motivation for doing so would have been to simplify the user's ability to maneuver between documents or displays, especially when a user may require special needs in manipulating a display. (See Slotznick, page 2, paragraph 0015 and 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Slotznick with Sanford, Kikuchi and Falcon for the benefit of ease of use of the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

Claims 14, 15, 33, 34, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) and Kikuchi (U.S.

Patent 4,819,189) as applied to claims 12, 31, and 37 above, and further in view of Simmons (U.S. Patent 6,396,488 B1).

As per claims 14, 18, 33, and 39, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claims 12, 31 and 37 as described above. Sanford and Kikuchi do not disclose expressly that the hierarchical diagram is a flow chart. Simmons discloses that a diagram may represent a flowchart. (See Simmons, Column 3, lines 48-50). Sanford, Kikuchi and Simmons are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating diagrams or displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the flowchart of Simmons. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to traverse a path within a diagram or display that has an arrangement of shapes. (See Simmons, Column 1, lines 55-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Simmons with Sanford and Kikuchi to provide a variety of shapes within which the user may maneuver the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 14, 18, 33, and 39.

As per claims 15, 34, and 40, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claims 12, 31 and 37 as described above. Sanford and Kikuchi do not disclose expressly that the hierarchical diagram is a state diagram. Simmons discloses that a diagram may represent any suitable graphics-based chart or diagram. (See Simmons, Column 3, lines 48-50). A state diagram is a diagram consisting of circles to represent states and directed line segments to represent transitions between the states (as referenced in [www.dictionary.com](http://www.dictionary.com)), which is

included in the definition of a graphics-based chart or diagram. Sanford, Kikuchi and Simmons are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating diagrams or displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the graphics-based diagram of Simmons. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to traverse a path within a diagram or display that has an arrangement of shapes. (See Simmons, Column 1, lines 55-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Simmons with Sanford and Kikuchi to provide a variety of shapes within which the user may maneuver the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15, 34, and 40.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) and Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189) as applied to claims 12, 31, and 37 above, and further in view of Simmons (U.S. Patent 6,396,488 B1) and Mathworks Stateflow 3.0.2.

As per claim 17, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Sanford and Kikuchi do not disclose expressly that the method is part of a stateflow editing application. Simmons discloses that a diagram may represent any suitable graphics-based chart or diagram. (See Simmons, Column 3, lines 48-50). A stateflow editing application provides users with the ability to develop graphical models of event-driven systems using finite state machine theory, statechart formalisms, and flow diagram notation (as

Art Unit: 2176

referenced at [www.mathworks.com](http://www.mathworks.com), Stateflow 3.0.2 product description); therefore, a stateflow chart is included in the definition of a graphics-based chart or diagram. Sanford, Kikuchi, Simmons and Mathworks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating diagrams or displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the graphics-based diagram of Simmons and Mathworks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to traverse a path within a diagram or display that has an arrangement of shapes. (See Simmons, Column 1, lines 55-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Simmons and Mathworks with Sanford and Kikuchi to provide a variety of shapes within which the user may maneuver the display to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claims 16 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford (U.S. Patent 6,256,028 B1) and Kikuchi (U.S. Patent 4,819,189) as applied to claims 12 and 31 above, and further in view of Simmons (U.S. Patent 6,396,488 B1) and Kodosky (U.S. Patent 4,901,221).

As per claims 16 and 31, Sanford and Kikuchi disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Sanford and Kikuchi do not disclose expressly that the method is part of a block diagram editor application. Simmons discloses that a diagram may represent any suitable graphics-based chart or diagram. (See Simmons, Column 3, lines 48-50). Kodosky discloses that a block editor can be used to construct and to display a graphical diagram (See



Art Unit: 2176

Kodosky, Column 7, lines 44-46); therefore, a block editor application may be used to construct a diagram suitable for use within the described invention.

Sanford, Kikuchi, Simmons and Kodosky are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating diagrams or displays. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method of Sanford and Kikuchi with the graphics-based diagram of Simmons and Kodosky. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system representing the flow of data graphically in order to more easily model processes. (See Kodosky, Column 3, lines 38-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sanford and Kikuchi with Simmons and Kodosky for the benefit of providing a simplified graphical modeling environment to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 35.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Plow (U.S. Patent 6,657,644 B1) discloses a method and system of displaying graphical images in a computer graphics system.
- Gardner (U.S. Patent 6,580,416 B1) discloses an opt-out actuator for which actuation is cancelled if the operator changes his or her state within a prescribed amount of time.

Art Unit: 2176


- Seidl (U.S. Patent 5,583,977) discloses a method and apparatus enabling direct manipulation of 3D curve images on a computer display.
- Janssen (U.S. Patent 6,512,529 B1) discloses a system providing a user interface for maximizing an amount of information presented on a computer generated display.
- Pook (ACM, "Context and Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces) discloses a system and method of enlarging information on a computer-based display.
- Mueller (ACM Multimedia 2000, "Mediacaptain – A Demo") discloses a system that facilitates indexing, browsing, summarizing and retrieval of video on the Web with support of supplementary material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is 703-605-1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair->

Art Unit: 2176

[direct.uspto.gov](http://direct.uspto.gov). Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR



SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER